

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 17 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 7 through 11 are canceled.

Claims 1 through 6, and 12 through 17 stand rejected.

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of July 14, 2005.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections

Obviousness Rejection Based on Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Hammond et al. (U.S. Patent 5,950,071)

Claims 1 through 6, and 12 through 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Hammond et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,950,071). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Applicant asserts that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the cited prior art reference must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Furthermore, the suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicant's disclosure.

After carefully considering the cited prior art, the rejections, and the Examiner's comments, Applicant has amended the claimed invention to clearly distinguish over the cited prior art.

Applicant asserts that the Hammond et al. reference does not and cannot a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 regarding the claimed invention of presently amended independent claims 1 and 12 because any combination of the Applicant's Admitted prior art and the Hammond et al. reference does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of presently amended independent claims 1 and 12.

Turing to the prior art, the Hammond et al. reference describes a process for detachment and removal of microscopic contaminant particles from a surface including a pulsed detach light directed at the surface to excite a contaminant particle thereon at or near its resonant frequency to thereby detach the particle from the surface. While the Hammond et al. reference teaches the use of a laser for ablation, turning a solid to a gas, of a material to carry contaminants away from the surface of the material, Hammond et al. does not teach or suggest roughening a surface for increased adherence of material thereto in a molding operation.

Applicant asserts that any combination of the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art and the Hammond et al. reference does not teach or suggest the claim limitations of presently amended independent claims 1 and 12 calling for "an interposer connected to the substrate, the interposer having a roughened surface formed by a laser increasing the surface area thereof to adhere mold material thereto in a molding operation" and "resist located on at least a portion of the surface having a portion thereof removed by etching the resist from the at least a portion of the surface of the substrate using a laser forming a roughened surface on the surface of the substrate of semiconductive material increasing the surface area of the surface to adhere mold material thereto". In contrast to the claim limitations of the claimed inventions of presently amended independent claims 1 and 12, the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art merely teaches the use of a laser for resist removal and the Hammond et al. reference merely teaches either ablative removal of a material and a process for detachment and removal of microscopic contaminant particles from a surface including a pulsed detach light directed at the surface to excite a contaminant particle thereon at or near its resonant frequency to thereby detach the particle from the surface. Such is not the claimed inventions of independent claims 1 and 12.

Therefore, claims 1 and 12 are allowable as well as the dependent claims therefrom.

Applicant submits that claims 1 through 6 and 12 through 17 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicant requests the allowance of claims 1 through 6 and 12 through 17 and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan
Registration No. 28,393
Attorney for Applicant
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: October 13, 2005
JRD/dlm:lmh

Document in ProLaw